Ideology, Politics, and Rebellion

The Impact of the 1715 and 1745 Rebellions on the Families of the Scottish Elite
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Last year, in my History in Practice project, I came across a bound volume of manuscripts, titled *The Papers of James Murray, second Duke of Atholl*, held in the Centre for Research Collections at University of Edinburgh Library. The second volume of the papers was primarily composed of letters addressed to the Duke concerning the Jacobite uprising over the period 1745 to 1746. Whilst examining these papers I began to discern certain themes from the content of the writing: the apparent good feeling that still existed between family members of opposing political factions, and, notably, the involvement of female family members in promulgating and utilising these family connections to curry favour within the political turmoil. My observations were drawn from the evidence in James Murray’s Papers alone and were focused solely on the inhabitants of the Atholl Estate. However, I found that once this first stone had been turned, the scope of my third-year project, confined as it was to a single primary source, could not do justice to the questions raised in this first investigation. So I have decided to develop my study of the Murray family, but this time with access to primary evidence from both the Hanoverian and Jacobite sources. My intention here is to gain a fuller picture of the relationships that existed between both sides of the family, given their divided political factions, to draw out possible conclusions that I will compare with sources on other noble families. From the nature of this study it is inevitable that some material from my third-year project must be cited and I fully acknowledge this in the footnotes.
INTRODUCTION

The accepted idea of the Forty-Five in the minds of most people is a hazy and picturesque combination of a picnic and a crusade ... In cold reality, Charles was unwanted and unwelcomed.¹

– Winifred Duke

Written in 1927 Duke’s assessment of the Prince’s landing brings into focus the divisive mood of the time. As popular history relates, many Highlanders did rally to the Prince, but, as Duke points out, many did not – even Cameron of Lochiel, his foremost supporter, took three weeks after the Prince’s landing to declare his full support.² In Scotland, the Stuart’s claim to the throne was intertwined with much of the religious and political conflict of the past century. Consequently, in terms of ideology, both the rebellions of 1715 and 1745 polarised the upper echelons Scottish society, so much so that individual families often had members fighting on either side.

Nevertheless, the thesis of this paper is that Scottish society maintained a sense of solidarity that rose above the ideological differences. It will contend that despite the division, a remarkable amount of good will continued to exist between members of opposing factions, whom often stepped into the breach to aid their compatriots caught with the wrong ideology - even when political tension had descended into violence. Moreover, this paper will further contend that women played a key role in cultivating these social connections and furthering the Jacobite cause in general.

¹ Duke, W., Lord George Murray and the Forty Five (Aberdeen: Milne and Hutchinson, 1927), p.66
I will approach this study by beginning with a micro-history of the Murrays of Atholl, based principally on the extensive primary sources that survive concerning their family. This will establish the state of elite family relations on a small scale, which I will then compare against the wider body of evidence from the Scottish nobility in general in the two subsequent chapters. Chapter 2 will focus specifically on the social conditions which fostered such common ideological differences, whilst Chapter 3 will consider the role of women within familial and wider politics. I am adopting this style of study, beginning with a case study and then widening the discussion, because I believe it lends itself well to subject that covers a relatively broad time period and group in society. It allows me to form hypotheses on a small scale and test them against the larger body of evidence, without the wealth of material on these two most-famous Jacobite rebellions clouding the picture.
CHAPTER 1.

THE MURRAYS OF ATHOLL

Before the discussion of family politics can begin, it is first necessary to offer a brief synopsis of the main figures that feature in the sources, and their respective political allegiances. The Murray family is an excellent starting point for a discussion on the interaction of kinship ties and partisan politics. A drastic political split ran straight through the middle of the family from the Fifteen right through to the Forty-Five.

The first figure to note is John, first Duke of Atholl, second Marquess of Tullibardine and patriarch of the Murray family. John, despite his rumoured involvement in the Jacobite invasion of 1707 and his staunch opposition to the Act of Union of the same year, was, by the Fifteen, unquestionably loyal to the Hanoverian government. He is known to have taken an active part in suppressing the rebels of the time. Nevertheless, out of his six surviving children from his first marriage, no less than half of them grew up to be active Jacobites. All three opposed their father in the Fifteen whilst two of them went on to become leading generals in the Forty-Five. William, the eldest surviving son and Marquess of Tullibardine, was the most committed to the Jacobite cause. Attainted after the Fifteen, he lived on the Continent until he landed with Prince Charles Edward Stuart in 1745. He became
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4 Ibid., ODNB
commander-in-chief of Charles’ forces north of the River Tay. His younger brother, Lord George Murray, also came out for the Jacobites in the Fifteen, though he was never attainted, and, after a brief spell on the Continent, returned to Scotland where, in 1724, he renounced Jacobitism. He lived as a Hanoverian, even becoming Sheriff Depute of his county, until at the last minute, abandoning his post and family and joining Prince Charles in 1745. Following the attainder on William, the government transferred his titles to the next brother Lord James Murray, an unwavering Hanoverian supporter. He succeeded his father as second Duke on his death in 1724. However, William never gave up his claim to the title. Thus, on his return to Scotland in 1745, Scotland hosted two men each claiming to be the rightful Duke of Atholl. For the sake of clarity, this paper will refer to them as Duke William, Duke James and their father as Duke John.

Evidently, the political split in the Murray family was no minor matter of nominal preference. The participants on both sides were very high profile and active campaigners for their opposing positions. Nevertheless, instances of familial ties overcoming political division appear regularly from the Fifteen to the Forty-Five. This first becomes apparent in the Murray family in the 1715 rising. Duke John did not well receive the news of William’s and George’s defection to the Jacobite cause. Having heard that William had defied his orders to visit his maternal grandmother in England (and had instead headed north with George to meet the Jacobite Earl of Mar), he expressed his displeasure to him in no uncertain terms. In
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6 Duke, Lord George Murray, p.37
7 Ibid., p.24
9 Pittock, ‘Murray, William (1689–1746)’, ODNB
a letter dated 12th August 1745, he wrote, “If you [William] continue in your disobedience to your father, you will neither prosper in this world nor be happy in the next, and your days will be short. If you obey not my commands in this, this shall be the last letter you receive from your father.” Clearly, the Duke was making a final dramatic attempt to prevent his eldest son and heir from total ruin. However, even the dire threat of paternal estrangement did little to dampen William’s rebellious spirit as he, George and Charles (their younger brother), all declared for ‘King James’ regardless.

This account hardly portrays a particularly warm family atmosphere. Yet, in the closing days of the Fifteen and despite his past threats, Duke John used all his (considerable) political influence to obtain pardons for all his sons - and indeed for his brother Lord Nairne. The charges against Charles and Nairne had been especially serious, as they had both held commissions in the Hanoverian army at the time of their defection to the Jacobite cause. Consequently, they had both faced court-martial and execution. Whilst working for these pardons, Duke John broke his promised silence with William, begging him (and George) to give themselves up, for there was little hope for a reprieve for Charles if his brothers were still in full rebellion. However, it was not only Charles’ life he was concerned for, in the letter he writes to William in November 1715, he promises “I shall also write to the court and make use of all the arguments and interests I may have to procure your pardon, and the lives of you and your Brothers.” Here is evidence that, despite having had his orders repeatedly disobeyed, his ultimatum ignored and despite having had to endure the

12 Duke, Lord George Murray, p.24
13 Atholl Chronicles, Vol. II., p.214
14 Ibid., p.214
humiliation of half his family in open rebellion, the Duke would still do anything in his power to save the lives of his own. Indeed, an extract from a letter sent to the Earl of Nottingham begging for Charles’ life shows more than anything that John’s paternal affection overcame his anger at his children’s betrayal “I do not extenuate or in any manner justify Lord Charles’ great crime, but most humbly and earnestly begs from his Majesty the life of a child” [sic]. The use of the word ‘child’ here is especially poignant. It demonstrates that the Duke was acting as a father not a politician – Charles was 24 year old army officer at the time. Subsequent events show that this was not the limit of the Duke’s ability to forgive his errant children. William and George refused their father’s offer and eventually escaped to the Continent. In 1723, as his health declined, one of the Duke’s last actions was to set about trying to obtain a pardon for his son George, who, unlike William, had not been attainted. He succeeded. However, although he lived to see his son return to Scotland again, the pardon did not come into effect until after Duke John’s death in 1724. Thus, right up to the moment of his death, it is evident that Duke John repeatedly acted to protect his family despite their dramatically opposing political positions.

Events leading up to the Forty-Five saw similar dissent in the Murray family. Lord George had, since his fathers’ death, become reconciled both with the Hanoverian Government and with his elder brother James. Relations between James’ and George’s families seem to have been close during this time. Letters were frequently exchanged between the brothers and their wives. James is recorded to have sent George a gift of some wine (notably before his
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17 Duke, *Lord George Murray*, pp.36-40
pardon had even been granted).  

Lord and Lady George requested that Duke James stand as godfather for their newly-born son. In the years that ran between George’s return and the Forty-Five, family relations remained good, as did Lord George’s promise to renounce his Jacobitism. This appeared to hold right up to 1745 when, on hearing of Prince Charles’ landing in Scotland, he promised to pass any information about rebel movements to his brother James. In these circumstances, it came as a particular shock when, in spite of his family and his post as Sheriff Depute, Lord George declared once more for the Jacobites on 3rd September 1745. He explained his choice in a letter written directly to Duke James. In it, he expresses the genuine anguish he feels at betraying his brother and endangering his family in the face of protecting his honour.

My Life, my Fortune, my expectations, the Happyness of my wife & children, are all at stake (& the chances are against me), & yet a principle of (what seems to me) Honour, & duty to King & Country, outweights evry thing. If I er, it is only with respect to you. I ow obligations to no body else [...] & if you cannot forgive me, yet sure you will pity me [...]

I will not venture to recommend her [his wife, Amelia] and my children to your protection. All I shall say on that head is, that a man of worth never repented of doing good natur’d offices [...] I shall conclude with declaring that if ever it should be
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18 *Atholl Chronicles*, Vol. II., p.386


20 Duke, Lord George Murray, pp.64-65

in my power to be of use to you, I would imbrace the occasion with grateful heart. [Sic] 22

Many allegations of treachery were aimed at Lord George after he wrote this letter. His sudden change of heart caused suspicion on both sides. 23 However, despite the obvious betrayal of Duke James, he appears to have acted with honourable intentions, pleading “Honour & a duty to King & Country” as his reason for disappointing James. As to his promise to uphold his loyalty to his family as well as his politics (“if ever it should be in my power to be of use to you, I would imbrace the occasion with grateful heart”), he was true to his word - as his actions taken during the siege of Edinburgh Castle in September 1745 demonstrate. During this military action, Lord George, who was a senior commander of the Prince’s forces, still found time to ensure that James’ two daughters, currently housed in Edinburgh, were safe and well. 24 He wrote to his wife “As I wrote to you on Friday last that Lady Jane and Lady Charlot Murray were in the greatest perplexity about the firing at the Castle, and that I thought it proper for you to come in to town to wait upon them...” [Sic]. 25 Here is Lord George, in the heat of battle, willing to summon his own wife to Edinburgh to care for his nieces. This is more than could be said for the girls’ father, the errant Duke James, who, having retreated to London, received this admonishing letter from one of them “Indeed Papa, I wish you would have pleased to have taken us to London, as I am sure it is a mercy we were not killed [...] I am quite surprised we haven’t had the favour of a line from yr GR/ since we parted...” [Sic]. 26 Thus, whilst James could not even spare a line for his frightened daughters, their uncle was apparently making arrangements for their safety

22 Atholl Chronicles, Vol. III, (3 September 1745), pp.19-20
23 Pittock, 'Murray, Lord George (1694–1760)', ODNB
24 Duke, Lord George Murray, p.93
25 Atholl Chronicles, Vol. III., (October 1745), p.60
26 Ibid., pp.60-1
Despite his busy schedule. Perhaps, this was because he was, as the Highlanders dubbed him, a ‘duine firinneach,’ ‘the righteous man’. But George would also have been well aware that a change in Jacobite fortunes would leave his own family very vulnerable indeed. He no doubt hoped that the generosity he had shown towards James’ children would be returned should the boot ever be on the other foot.

If this was indeed Lord George’s strategy, then it was an effective one, for, when the boot was later on the other foot, James allowed George’s wife and children to remain unmolested in their family home at Tullibardine Castle – even though James could never forgive his brother for his actions. As the Hanoverians pushed the Jacobite forces northwards, the family became highly vulnerable to the advancing army, yet they remained in place, at James’ pleasure, right up to early 1746 when the shortage of supplies necessitated their removal. George’s wife, Lady Amelia Murray herself demonstrated how aware she was of the vulnerability of her position when she wrote to Duke James, declaring that she was “…so sensible of your Graces goodness and humanity to me at this time, I beg leave to return my most humble thanks I shall always have the most grateful sense of so much goodness” (Tullibardine, 16th February 1746). This protection of Amelia Murray seems even more remarkable as she was herself a committed Jacobite. Evidence of this arises from the Jacobite Correspondence of the Atholl family; during the rebellion, M.DCC.XLV.-M.DCC. In a letter, dated 22nd September 1745 from Tullibardine, Amelia began a long correspondence with her brother-in-law, the Jacobite Duke William, acquainting him with all the news she could gather of the rebellion. It goes as follows:
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27 Duke, Lord George Murray, p.252
I pray God continue to Prosper His Royal Highness’ Arms, and congratulates your Grace upon this Happy success. Tho’ ‘tis like your Grace will have a more particular account of what has happened before this account comes to your hands, yet in case it has not, I thought it my duty to acquaint you of what I heard, imagining that your Friends wou’d not find the time for writing immediately after the Engagement. [Sic]

Her messages were evidently well received as Duke William responded enthusiastically on the same day:

About Midday I was most agreeably surprised by your Ladyship’s delightful letter, giving the only distinct Account that has yet come here of the victory gain’d by His Royal Highness’ army […] Pray, Madam be so good as to continue your useful endeavours towards acquainting us with what your hear. [Sic]

Amelia did not fail to note this request and corresponded with Duke William regularly until January 1746, when the arrival of a new baby necessitated that her daughter write for her in her stead. Therefore, in light of the fact that Amelia Murray was acting as a political informant to Jacobite forces, it is even more surprising that Duke James accorded her such lenient treatment. Lord George at any rate believed the strength of the family connection would prevail. Writing to Amelia in January 1746, he remarked that “I am persuaded you can trust James”. Though whether James knew of her double-dealing we cannot know.

The charity Duke James showed some of his female rebel relatives can be further seen in a letter which he received from his aunt, Lady Margaret Nairne (wife of the Jacobite
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31 Ibid., p.20

32 Ibid., p.170

33 Atholl Chronicles, Vol. III, p.170
commander Lord Nairne whom Duke John saved from execution after the Fifteen). Writing from Stanly on 5th February 1746, she states, “Just now I hear that your Grace is arived in Perth and trusting to my dr [dear] Lords friendship and yours makes me have the assurance to writ your Grace to beg you will take care of me and all belonging to your old friend” [Sic].

Though an investigation did take place against Lady Nairne, the staunch old Jacobite lady was never prosecuted. Unfortunately, we do not have James’ response to this letter so we can never be sure if this reprieve was his responsibility, however, we do know that he spoke out for her daughter the notorious Lady Lude (also never prosecuted), so it is not unreasonable to speculate that he may have done the same for her mother.

Though James appears to have forgiven his female relatives, the pressure the Forty-Five put on his personal relationship with his brother George created an irreparable damage. There is no evidence to suggest that he ever made an attempt to secure a pardon for George (ambitious though that would have been for such a prominent Jacobite general), in contrast to the actions of his father after the Fifteen. The clearest manifestation of this surviving ill-will is a letter from 1720 that George wrote to James after the death of his five year old child in 1740, requesting that both he and his wife could be buried in the Dunkeld chapel to be close to the ones they loved. He writes

My wife & I take this occasion to ask a favour of you that you will allow this chapel to be the place of our interment. We are both sensible that it is a matter of great
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34 Nairn, Margaret. ‘Margaret Nairn to James Murray’, February, 1746. Letter. Edinburgh University Library, The Papers of James Murray, Second Duke of Atholl, Dc.1.37/2, folio no. 90. As also discussed in my third year project.
35 Duke, Lord George Murray, p.68
36 Ibid., p.68
37 Lenman, The Jacobite Rising, p.146
indifference where the body lys after Death, but it pleases Whilest in Life to think of being laid near to those we loved. [Sic]\(^{38}\)

Despite out-living his brother by two years, James never made a move to fulfil this request and left the body of George to be buried in exile in Holland, far away from those that he loved.\(^{39}\) Conversely, this action, when seen alongside James' provision for George's family in the rebellion, testifies to the strength of the family bonds more than ever. As it demonstrates that even in the case of personal estrangement, the good relations of the two families as a whole survived. This further evidenced from the fact that he made George’s son, John, his heir to the dukedom of Atholl through marriage to his daughter Charlotte.\(^{40}\)

Thus, a remarkable picture of Murray family loyalty survives amongst the deep political divisions of rebellion. It is now the task of the following chapter to determine whether the Murray family were exceptional in this respect or if this was in fact a cultural trend that can be identified across the whole of the Highland Scottish nobility.

\(^{39}\) Pittock, ‘Murray, Lord George (1694–1760)’ ODNB
The Social Relations of the Eighteenth-Century Scottish Nobility

The behaviour of the Murray family during the Fifteen and the Forty-Five has been discussed in depth in the previous chapter. It is the purpose of this Chapter to consider the extent to which the behaviour of the Murray family was typical of the practices of the wider Scottish nobility. Firstly, I will consider how social conditions in the eighteenth century fostered good social terms amongst the Scottish nobility, despite their common political and religious differences. Secondly, I will examine the nature of the family divisions, considering whether or not the rebel Murrays were unusual for their purely ideological Jacobitism.

I.

In many respects, by the eighteenth century, Scottish society was characterised by division. The survival of the clan system in the Highlands contrasted starkly with the Lowlands, where the relationship between landlord and tenant followed a form similar to the English feudal system.\textsuperscript{41} The religious turmoil of the previous century had produced geographical pockets of different Christian denominations. As a general rule, it was Presbyterian in the Lowland areas and Episcopalian in the Highlands whilst a smattering of Catholicism remained in the North West.\textsuperscript{42} Such was the strength of this religious conflict that political affiliations had formed alongside it: Scottish Whig politicians were synonymous with Presbyterianism, and any Tories were usually Episcopalian.

\textsuperscript{41} Szechi, D., \textit{George Lockhart of Carnwath 1689-1727} (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2002), p.37
\textsuperscript{42} Pittock, Murray, G. H., \textit{Jacobitism} (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998), pp.1-3
Consequently, post-union Scotland had developed a landed political elite consisting of diverse religious and political allegiances, influenced to various extents by inherited values from the previous century. The effect was divisive, and the Murrays were by no means the only great family to undergo a political schism. As Daniel Szechi and Margaret Sankey argue in their study on Scottish elite culture in the period 1716 to 1746, the chances of being related to someone with opposing views were just part of life in a society where elite families married exclusively within their own class, yet were characterised by intensely diverse political and religious allegiance. This was clearly true within the Murray family. Even though the Duke John was a declared Presbyterian and Hanoverian, he was still close enough to his sister in-law, the redoubtable Jacobite Lady Margaret Nairne, to commission her to design his court house in 1707 (though he did later blame her for igniting the Jacobitism in his sons). This friendship was shared by his English wife, Lady Katherine Hamilton, who regularly corresponded with Nairne despite having, as Nicola Cowmeadow highlights, “many a dispute” over religion. In fact, their relationship was so close that they even shared poetry and promised to name children after one another - a demonstration that everyday life and friendship could continue without religious consensus.

In fact, as Ian Grimble contends, this level of political division within a social network was not unique to the Murrays. The microcosms of ‘inherited attitudes’ affected individual
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47 Cowmeadow, ‘Simply a Jacobite Heroine?’, p.33 – also cited in my third year project
48 Ibid., p.33
families as well as their ancestral clans all over Scotland. The Mackenzie chief, the Earl of Seaford, lived in exile in Paris after the Fifteen, whilst his son, Lord Fortrose, remained in Scotland as a loyal Hanoverian. Instances of divided political loyalties in families were not just confined to father-son relationships (though this was undoubtedly a symptom of a tactical division as we will see later in the chapter). Like the Murrays, whole families often stood on either side of the conflict. For example, Sir Thomas Kennedy, a Lord Provost of Edinburgh in the 1680’s, had seven sons who were represented on both sides in the Fifteen – three Jacobites and four Whigs (inspiring the book *The Seven Sons of The Provost*).

In fact, very few noble families could then claim to have an entirely homogenous political outlook. Accordingly, high Scottish society had to be preserved by reliance on a genteel sociability that accommodated political disagreement within great families. Jacobites would constantly pay social calls upon their Hanoverian cousins, there would be exchanges of small gifts and attendance at such family events that expressed neighbourly respect: christenings, funerals and the like. Through such regular encounters extensive social networks were built up and any political tensions overcome by the constant exposure to neighbourly society. Small gestures of dissent were cultivated to allow members of the gentry to get by without compromising their principles or offending their neighbours. One such instance is cited in Edmund Burt’s letters, written to a London acquaintance in 1730’s but not published until 1754. Burt observes of the Episcopalians in the Church of Aberdeen that:

49 Grimble, ‘Houses Divided’, p.114
50 Ibid., p.116
52 Sankey and Szechi, ‘Elite Culture’, p.105
53 Ibid., pp.103-104
When the Minister came to that Part of the Litany where the King is prayed for by Name, the People all rose up as one, in Contempt of it, and Men and Women set themselves about some trivial Action, as taking Snuff, &c., to show their Dislike, and signify to each other they were all of one Mind. [Sic]54

By standing up on some pretext or other whilst the prayers for the King were being read, the Jacobites could attend church services without compromising their allegiance to the ‘king over the water’.

A past master of this sort of social engagement was George Lockhart of Carnwath. An Episcopalian and notorious Jacobite, he managed to avoid societal marginalisation (following various Jacobite escapades) by creating enough social goodwill to overlook it. He achieved this through the vigorous pursuit of pastimes popular with the nobility - hunting and horse racing, and by tactically bestowing little gifts upon friends who may have been tiring of his political antics.55 The result was that, by the time of his death, he could boast a circle of friends that represented the entire politico-religious spectrum of the Scottish elite.56

In a society that had endured so much upheaval in the past century, these social ties were beneficial for political as well as social reasons. Sankey and Szechi explain, in the political system prevailing outside urban areas, most voters were wealthy in their own right. Thus, if one wanted to obtain votes or political influence, personal ties were a better currency than monetary bribes.57 In times of conflict, this pre-existing tendency to rely on personal
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54 William Patterson (ed.), *Burt’s Letters from the North of Scotland* (Second Edn., Edinburgh, 1876) online edn. [goo.gl/ueC9Mr accessed on 22 Feb 2017] Letter XI, p.223
55 Szechi, *George Lockhart*, p.41
56 Ibid., p.41
57 Sankey and Szechi, ‘Elite Culture’, p.105
connections became very useful. During the Fifteen, when territory was passing between Hanoverian and Jacobite control, residents professing the wrong ideology had to rely on their connections to save themselves and their property.\textsuperscript{58} Many instances of small acts by members of both parties to save their neighbours’ property or lands survive from the Fifteen. The case of the notorious turncoat Lord Lovat (at this time a proclaimed Hanoverian) stoutly promising never to attack the lands of the Jacobite Marquess of Huntly, and Huntly promptly returning the assurance, shows good feeling could survive even when the political tension had descended into violence.\textsuperscript{59}

The exploitation of these personal ties becomes most obvious in the wake of the Fifteen, when Jacobite activists were seeking to mitigate their actions through the intervention of their Whig acquaintances. As we have seen in Chapter One, this certainly occurred in the Murray family with Duke John acting on behalf of his sons and brother. Although this could conceivably be explained by familial loyalty, an examination of the wider nobility shows that these interventions were commonly extended to acquaintances who were not close relatives. George Lockhart, the master of social interaction, forms an excellent case study for this.

George was the son of the Episcopalian Sir George Lockhart (senior) and his second wife Philadelphia, the English Presbyterian daughter of Baron Wharton. On the murder of his father in 1689, Wharton soon intervened in the Lockhart’s household, having George’s Episcopalian tutor removed, and George himself relocated to live in the household of Archibald Campbell, first Duke of Argyll – the most notable Presbyterian family in the

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., pp.105-106
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., p.106
Highlands. Though Lockhart never liked the first Duke and developed a strong aversion to Presbyterianism whilst he was housed with him, he did develop a strong friendship with his two sons John and Archibald. The friendship turned out to be a valuable one, as the consequences of Lockhart’s incorrigible Jacobite activities were mitigated on more than one occasion by the intervention of his powerful friends. On the first occasion John, now the second Duke of Argyll and then head of the Hanoverian forces in Scotland, obtained a pardon for Lockhart after his arrest for involvement in the August plots that preceded the Fifteen. Lockhart’s second reprieve followed shortly after, he was re-arrested in October for having resumed rebellious action and returned to Edinburgh Castle. Despite repeated offences, the Campbell brothers’ tolerance of his actions appeared not to wane. On hearing of Lockhart’s ill health in prison, Argyll’s younger brother Archibald, Earl of Islay, interceded on behalf of Lockhart and he was released in January – once again a free man.

However, Lockhart’s thirst for rebellion was still not slaked. In 1727, he faced arrest again – giving rise to yet another intervention from his Hanoverian friends. This time he escaped the confines of prison by receiving warning of his imminent arrest from both Charles Erskine, the Solicitor General, and James Erskine, the Lord Justice Clerk. Both of these men were flagrantly undermining their positions in the justice system by tipping Lockhart off - thus demonstrating the strength of personal ties in the Scottish nobility. Lockhart did not even remain in exile long, as the Campbell brothers – despite Lockhart’s evident lack of intention to reform – once again interceded for him alongside Duncan Forbes of Culloden and he was
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64 Szechi, ‘Lockhart, George, of Carnwath’, *ODNB*
65 Szechi, *George Lockhart*, pp.41-42
allowed to return home.\textsuperscript{66} The extraordinary tolerance demonstrated by the Campbells echoes that of the first Duke of Atholl in repeatedly offering to intercede for his sons despite their continual disaffection. The actions of two speak volumes for the power of social connections, for neither Atholl nor the Campbells had anything to gain politically by helping out such serial offenders. In fact, the opposite was true. In 1716, the Earl of Islay faced criticism from the Government for his leniency after he released Lockhart from prison.\textsuperscript{67}

Furthermore, the cases of Lockhart and Atholl were by no means isolated incidences. As Bruce Lenman points out, despite the serious threat the Fifteen rebellion posed, only two noblemen ended up being executed - probably because they were “not well connected enough to create lasting resentment from key politicians”.\textsuperscript{68} This did not go unnoticed at the time. John Roberts quotes Duncan Forbes of Culloden (a lifelong Whig who was nonetheless sympathetic to the plight of his Jacobite countrymen after the Fifteen), in August 1716, stating that there were “not two hundred gentlemen in the whole kingdom who are not very nearly related to someone or other of the rebels”.\textsuperscript{69} There are further notable examples of intercessions from Argyll, Islay, Montrose, Stair and Forbes, descriptions of which unfortunately go beyond the scope of this discussion.\textsuperscript{70} Overall, the evidence suggests that the treatment of the rebellious Murrays and Lockhart were not in the least exceptional but was the standard reaction of a socially united, yet politically divided, nobility.

Cases discussed so far relate primarily to the Fifteen and its aftermath. There appears to be little evidence of this sort of action after the Forty-Five, when only two major noblemen, the Earl of Cromarty and Lord Macleod, successfully used their connections to obtain pardons

\begin{footnotes}
\item[66] Ibid., pp.41-42
\item[67] Sankey and Szechi, ‘Elite Culture’, p.121
\item[68] Lenman, \textit{The Jacobite}, pp.160-1
\item[69] Roberts, J., \textit{The Jacobite Wars}, p.55
\item[70] Sankey and Szechi, ‘Elite Culture’, p.118
\end{footnotes}
for their part in the rebellion.\textsuperscript{71} In the Murray family, Duke James, unlike his father before him, certainly did not attempt to obtain pardons for his male Jacobite relatives after the Forty-Five.\textsuperscript{72} Sankey and Szechi attribute this to the Government having had such a scare by the near success of this second rebellion that they were in no mood to be again lenient towards its participants.\textsuperscript{73} Moreover, as Lenman highlights, the Fifteen came partly as a result of the Scottish nobility having had enough of post-union British politics and suddenly finding the non-dynastic element of the Stuart cause with which many Scottish Whig politicians sympathised.\textsuperscript{74} The first Duke of Atholl for example had conscientiously opposed the Fifteen and yet had himself been staunchly anti-Union in 1707.\textsuperscript{75} This is also evident from the fact that the collection raised for the Scottish soldiers taken south to Carlisle to be tried in English courts – a flagrant violation of the terms of the Union – had contributions from many Scottish Whig as well as Tory pockets.\textsuperscript{76} The result was that, whereas in the wake of the Fifteen, many (if not most) of the Whig political elite were willing to intercede for their Jacobite acquaintances, the harsher policy of the Government post-1745 combined with nearly thirty further years of peace under the Union, had sapped the nobility’s ability and indeed enthusiasm to repeat the feat after the downfall of Bonnie Prince Charlie. This could go some way to explaining why Duke James never spoke out for his brother George.
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\textsuperscript{72} Lenman, B., \textit{The Jacobite Rising}, p.146  
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The first part of this Chapter has dealt with the social context that created ideologically based splits between families, Jacobite and Whig. However, there were also families and clans who chose to divide their loyalties for purely pragmatic rather than ideological reasons. Lenman lays this charge at the Murrays’ door for their actions at Killiecrankie in 1689 but by the Fifteen he concedes that they were also driven by deep ideological conviction.\footnote{Ibid., p.146} This was undoubtedly so, as we have seen in Chapter one, when Duke John tried in vain to persuade his sons to return to the Hanoverian side. Indeed, Lord George clarified his motivations himself writing that it was “Honour, & duty to King & Country” that brought him out.\footnote{Atholl Chronicles, Vol III, p.19} This is supported by the fact that Lord George, alone amongst those who rallied to Prince Charles, had a government position to lose by joining him.\footnote{Hook, M., and Ross, W., \textit{The \textquoteleft Forty Five: The Last Jacobite Rebellion} (Edinburgh: National Library of Scotland: HMSO, 1995), pp.14-5} However, it does not seem that all the supporters of the Stuarts were driven by conscience. Though many nobles, by no means devoid of interest in the Hanoverian regime, came out in the Fifteen (e.g. George Lockhart of Carnwath, the Earl of Seaforth, the Marquess of Tullibardine) the failure of that rebellion seems to have cooled the fervour for revolt amongst many of the Jacobite families and clans. Indeed, the practice arose for clans, uncertain of the Young Pretender’s chances, to hedge their bets by turning out family members on both sides, so that whatever the outcome, the lands and titles would remain in family hands. Some notable examples were Simon, Lord Lovat, Chief of Clan Fraser, Lord Glengarry and Macdonald of Ranald.\footnote{Ibid., p.16}

Lovat’s case is particularly interesting as he changed sides several times throughout his life. Evidence of this double-dealing survives in the record of his correspondence with Duncan Forbes of Culloden during the outset of the Forty-Five. He appears to use his connection to...
Forbes, a Whig beyond repute, to mask his Jacobite activities at his family seat in Castle Dounie. He writes to Forbes as follows “I do solemnly declare to your lordship that nothing ever vexed my soul so much as my son’s resolution to go and join the prince”.  

He does not stop here but goes on to refer to his son in colourful and derogatory terms. In later letters to Forbes (no doubt to add sincerity to his claim) he describes him as an “undutiful and unnatural son” and “mad youth”. Yet, at the same time, he was writing to his secretary Murray of Broughton “that it was the greatest grief of my life, that my indisposition and severe sickness kept me from going south to my dear brave prince” and that he in his stead had to send “my eldest son, the hopes of my family, and darling of my life” – a drastically different description to the one he provided for Forbes. Lovat’s son was in fact only nineteen years old at the time but nonetheless a professed Whig who was forced out by his father against his will. Clearly, Lovat was exploiting both his son and his personal connection with Forbes (once again demonstrating the value of social ties), in an attempt to hedge his bets so that whatever happened in the rebellion, his family would survive.

Though the pragmatic split is often characterized by a father-son division – as with the Lovats – it was not exclusively so. The last case study this chapter will investigate is in many ways the most remarkable, for it involved a familial split between husband and wife, in the form of Aeneas and Anne Mackintosh of Clan Chattan. By 1745, Aeneas Mackintosh, company commander in the Government’s Black Watch in Scotland, was in a battle with his cousin Ewan Cluny for the leadership of Clan Chattan. Despite toying with the idea of
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declaring for the Jacobites in 1745, he changed his mind when his rival Cluny was nominated as head of the clan by the Prince, seeing little future on the Jacobite side.86 Aeneas promptly threw his lot in with the Government, raising a full company from Clan Chattan on their behalf.87 In the meantime, however, his wife, Lady Anne Mackintosh, personally raised 600 men for the Jacobite cause.88

Though no direct evidence exists for whether Anne was acting in defiance of her husband’s wishes, or if the couple planned this action together, certain indications suggest that the latter was more probable. First, Aeneas was not staunchly anti-Jacobite as his earlier indecision had shown. Second, though Jacobite women could be imprisoned for their actions, they could not be exiled or executed like their male counterparts,89 making Anne, in the absence of any children, an ideal candidate to lead out the Clan. Thirdly, Anne forewarned Aeneas when their estates were in danger of being plundered by the Jacobites in 1746 – resulting in Aeneas sending troops to protect them – clear evidence that, for Anne, the preservation of the family estates was a priority above political loyalty.90 Finally, reunited after Aeneas was captured and handed over into his wife’s custody (earning her the nickname Colonel Anne91) they remained together despite their ‘political differences’, presumably in a relatively happy state as, years later, they were seen in public together at a dance in Edinburgh.92
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Thus, the extensive primary sources available on the Murray family are valuable as evidence on two counts - firstly for what they reveal about the complexity of their family relations during the Jacobite rebellions but also, as this Chapter has tried to demonstrate, as a starting point for a wider investigation into the social practices of the whole Scottish nobility. The same factors that caused such a drastic political split in the Murray family, and that led the first duke, John Murray, to intercede on behalf of his relatives, can also be seen to have acted upon many others who responded in a similar manner to preserve the Scottish nobility – especially after the Fifteen.

However, the Murray family were, to some extent, atypical of their time. The all-consuming ideological commitment to Jacobitism of Lord George and the Marquess of Tullibardine in the Forty-Five was at odds with the more pragmatic approach of the other noble families. Though the instances of fragmented loyalty did not drop in the Forty-Five compared to the Fifteen, they seem to have taken on a characteristic of tactical rather than purely ideological division, as the cases of both Lovat and the Mackintoshes have shown. This is hardly surprising, for if the Scottish nobility had not been hardy, resourceful and at times self-serving, they would have been unlikely to have survived nearly two centuries of ongoing religious upheaval, three major rebellions and a union with England.

CHAPTER 3.

THE WOMEN OF THE FIFTEEN AND FORTY-FIVE

The final theme that can be discerned from the case study of the Murrays is the active involvement of women in the immediate family, and indeed, wider politics. We have seen
that Amelia Murray was at one stage capable of sending information to the Jacobite Duke William, whilst begging favours from Duke James at another. She exemplifies a common role for women active in politics but limited in mobility - the informant. But, what she is especially useful for here is drawing our attention to the political manoeuvrings, participation and ideology of the female Highland gentry. This final chapter will investigate their participation not only in family politics but also as active rebels in their own right. It will contend that women were essential for maintaining the social relationships that underpinned the survival of the Scottish nobility (discussed in the previous chapter), but also that the culture of eighteenth-century Highland society made Jacobite politics more accessible to women than in Hanoverian society. In some cases, this went so far as active involvement in the rebellions themselves.

One thing to note before proceeding is that, as elsewhere in western history, there is an inherent problem of lack of evidence of the female perspective. This is especially acute here as, at that time, literacy rates of women in the Highlands were still lower than elsewhere in Britain, and very much lower than their male counterparts. However, the impact of urban society was beginning to reach the Highlands and, as such, women from the most elite families were receiving a formal education, often in boarding institutions in Edinburgh, Perth or Inverness, and hence were beginning to enter the written record on an unprecedented scale. However, despite this progress, this level of education was only within the remit of the upper classes. The majority of women outside the gentry would not have been literate at all. Nevertheless we are assisted by the survival of various case studies
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of women who were educated or notable enough to create a record. Their actions will be considered within the broader cultural context, in an attempt to provide a more nuanced evaluation.

I.

As we have seen with Amelia Murray, Scottish noble women were capable of establishing social networks that could advance or protect a family in a society characterised by social upheaval. On marriage, social convention demanded that women augment their family’s connections and influence as much as they could. A crucial part of this was the negotiation of advantageous marriage contracts for their own children.  

96 In the same manner as men, regular contact proved to be best way to advance these connections. Life on Scottish Highland estates could be lonely. Consequently, women regularly travelled and visited neighbours creating ‘semi-independent’ social circles of their own.  

97 These connections came into their own after the Fifteen, when the Scottish nobility were engaging their full arsenal of contacts to obtain pardons. Much evidence survives from this era representing women in multiple capacities. Firstly, they acted as recipients of petitions, either appealing to their own influence, or as an intermediary for a powerful male relative. The Marchioness of Huntly for example drew upon her father’s connections on behalf of her sister-in-law Lady Jean Drummond to prevent the loss of her estates after the Fifteen.  

98 Though no doubt some of these petitions were received out of sympathy, the process of being petitioned had
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its benefits as it marked the person out as an influential figure and gained them a political debt - often from a person technically of a higher rank.99

Conversely, they had another key role as a petitioner. Some women went to extreme lengths to try and procure freedom for their relatives. Lady Nairne, as we have seen, wrote to Duke James after the Forty-Five, but she was also active thirty years earlier petitioning both Queen Anne and the Countess of Lippe-Buckenburg for the life of her husband.100 Lady Nithsdale managed to orchestrate the spectacular rescue of her husband out of the Tower of London on the eve of his execution, smuggling him out dressed in the clothes of her (conveniently pregnant) lady-in-waiting during a visit.101 She then relied on her connections with another powerful lady for her own salvation, taking refuge in the house of the pro-Hanoverian Duchess of Montrose before departing to the Continent.102 There are a number of similar examples. It is fair to say that eighteenth-century women, when it came to protecting family members and interests under threat, were just as adept at exploiting their personal connections as men. This is something they would not have been able to do without the considerable experience of net-working built up in peacetime. Although clearly women were less militarily active than men in the campaigns, it would be unfair to suggest that their role in the rebellion was restricted to merely salvaging the wreck of their male relatives’ failed rebellions. Many of them were not only staunch Jacobites themselves, but also active participants in the dissemination of Jacobite ideology within their social networks. In this respect, Lady Margaret Nairne, a stalwart Jacobite and unsung hero of the cause, stands out.

99 Ibid., p.120
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Lady Margaret was the sole surviving child of the first Lord Nairne and his wife Margaret Graham, and hence became Baroness of Nairne in her own right. In 1690, she married Lord William Murray, brother to our own John Murray, first Duke of Atholl. Between 1690 and 1714, they had twelve children, of which no less than ten were active in the Forty-Five. But even they managed to produce a Whig, their son James— a testament that politics could be divisive in even the most staunchly Jacobite families. Margaret and her husband were both Jacobites and non-juring Episcopalians but, as Paul Hopkins highlights, Margaret was ‘a far stronger character and Jacobite than her husband’. This is evident from the way she managed to use her traditional role of negotiating her childrens’ marriages in order to strengthen the family’s Jacobite connections – she married six of her daughters to known Jacobite supporters. But, more than this, she succeeded in directly instilling Jacobite values into her children, all but James coming out in the Forty-Five. Most remarkably, she produced an indomitable Jacobite spirit in her daughters, likely through the Highland custom of mothers taking on their daughters’ education. Her daughter, Lady Charlotte Lude, certainly displayed no qualms about her political convictions. In Thomas Bisset’s account of her behaviour during the Jacobite occupation of Blair Castle, seat of the Atholl family, he states “that she was Treating and Dancing with the party of Rebells that seized Sir Andrew Agnew’s out Guards applauding them for what they had done, It was talked that she fired one of the cannons at the castle with her own hand”. [Sic] Clearly, Charlotte was a zealous Jacobite in her own right. Indeed, she was identified as such by the
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Government in the wake of the rebellion, but managed to avoid trial. However, the tendrils of Lady Margaret’s Jacobitism reached further than her immediate family. Despite religious differences, the Nairne family and the Murray family enjoyed a close relationship. The close contact of the two families gave Lady Margaret the opportunity to inspire the Duke’s three sons William, George and Charles with her Jacobitism. In 1715, the cordiality ended as Duke John, in a letter to James Murray of Garth, denounced her as the ‘wors woman’ on account of her tempting his sons into the 1715 rising.

So, Lady Margaret was certainly no stranger to politics in her own right. She manipulated the position society had given her - as a matriarch and educator - to her own ends, disseminating her political ideology throughout the family. It is fortunate that the record of Margaret Nairne, as a highly educated and well-connected woman, survives for she exemplifies the way in which women could engage the power of their traditional role in the domestic sphere to their advantage. It is reasonable to suppose that if Lady Margaret was behaving in this way, other less well-documented ladies might be using their positions to the same effect. It is certainly unlikely that such a widespread movement would just pass them by.

II.

Though Lady Margaret was evidently an active Jacobite and a great force for the cause, her activities never attracted the attention of the wider public. Despite her energy, she never deviated significantly from the perceived sphere of female influence. She utilised her family connections to great effect, only venturing into public to petition for the life of her husband.
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However, it was the women who took an active role in the military campaign that caught the public eye. At a time of rebellion, the usual values of society are thrown into turmoil - giving women the opportunity to act outside their usual ‘place’ in society.\footnote{McLynn, Jacobites, p.154} In 1745, this manifested itself most notably by women personally raising and taking troops to Prince Charles. This was an act that was so flagrantly outside the behavioural norm for an eighteenth-century lady that it was immediately highlighted by both Hanoverian propaganda and by pro-Jacobite romantic works. Interestingly, both interpretations, though different in intent, have the same effect of dramatically exaggerating the military role of these women. Both would have us (falsely) believe these women personally led them into battle and fought on the actual fields. Nevertheless, women taking any part in military activity at this time is remarkable and their contribution should not be dismissed simply because of the propaganda that has grown up around them. Jenny Cameron, for example, was an extraordinary woman on many counts. Following Thompson’s description she was a widow of “upwards of forty” who acted as guardian and managed the estates of her nephew during his minority, continuing to do so after he came of age due to his “weak intellect”.\footnote{Thomson. A. T., Memoirs of the Jacobites of 1715 and 1745 (London: R. Bentley, 1845), p.360} Consequently, when the clan summons by Cameron of Lochiel reached her nephew’s estates in 1745, it was she who raised their troops and led them to the Prince. An account from 1746 paints a dramatic picture:

> Having collected a troop of two hundred and fifty men, she marched at the head of it to the camp at Glenfinnin. She was dressed in a sea-green riding-habit, with a scarlet lappet, laced with gold; her hair was tied behind in loose curls, and surmounted with a velvet cap, and a scarlet feather. She rode a bay gelding, with green furniture,
richly trimmed with gold; in her hand she carried a naked sword instead of a riding-whip.  

113

Though this is evidently a heavily romanticised description, it is based on truth. Jenny Cameron did indeed raise troops for the Jacobites and stayed with the camp until they set out for England, an action that gained her notoriety on both sides.  

114

The above description is from a pro-Jacobite booklet published in 1746 by an anonymous author using Arbuthnot as a pseudonym. It marks the start of the romanticising of the lost cause which would grow up around the Forty-Five into the nineteenth century.  

115

Such was her notoriety that it even reached the Hanoverian leader, the Duke of Cumberland, who was delighted when, in February 1746, he announced that he had caught ‘the famous Jenny Cameron’.  

116

Sadly for him, though, he had in fact caught the wrong woman.  

117

Indeed, people were so shocked by her actions that, where she received a glorified account for the Jacobites, she was picked up as a comic figure by the Hanoverians. Multiple prints, such as the ones featured below, were spread of Mistress Cameron in an attempt by the Government to discredit the ongoing threat of Jacobitism.
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112 Arbuthnot, A., A Brief Account of the Life and Family of Miss Jenny Cameron, (London: T. Gardener, 1746), accessed online 8 March 2017 [https://biturl.io/VZVHS7], p.45
114 Thompson, Memoirs, p.361
117 Ibid., p.103
A print, 'Miss Jenny Cameron, in her Military Habit'.\textsuperscript{118}

\textit{Public Advertiser} 11\textsuperscript{th} June 1753

"Miss Jenny Cameron, in a Military Dress, as she appear’d in the Army"

\begin{figure}
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\caption{Jenny Cameron ‘Tocqui’ after Aikman,\textsuperscript{119}}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{118} Sharpe, \textit{Engraved Record}, p.145

\textsuperscript{119} Sharpe, \textit{Engraved Record}, p.145
Both images play on the idea of the ‘unnaturalness’ of women fighters. The first depicts her in full male military costume whilst the second mocks her as a Scottish ‘Amazon’ figure (see 119 Ibid., p.34)
accompanying poem) – a theme that was common in Hanoverian propaganda. Murray Pittock neatly sums up this technique: “[Jenny Cameron became] the archetypal Jacobite woman soldier: depicted fully armed, ‘the bold Amazon of the North’ signified the sexual vigour, alien threat and role-altering qualities of an all too contemporary revolutionary movement”. In other words, whereas pro-Jacobite propaganda sought to romanticise the military involvement of women, the Hanoverian side sort to discredit it as a threat to the natural order of society. In so doing, however, both acknowledge its existence.

Though Jenny Cameron attracted a lot of attention she was by no means the only woman to engage in military activity. We have already seen that Lady Anne Mackintosh raised 600 men for the Prince in 1746. Just like Jenny Cameron, Lady Anne’s military escapades did not escape the popular narratives of female fighters. The English were reportedly obsessed with the idea of her being an ‘Amazonian fighting figure’ of abnormal size. Whilst, as Nicholson points out, Sir Walter Scott, in the nineteenth century, described her as a ‘Highland Joan of Arc’ who personally led out her troops. Anne certainly inspected her troops but there is little evidence that she ever ventured far from her home at Moy Hall during the rebellion. Some ladies, however, did demonstrate their loyalty to the cause by accompanying the army around its camps. James Ray in his 1760 memoir of the 1745 rebellion refers to this, writing that, in the wake of Culloden:

Four of their principal Ladies also fell into our Hands, viz. Lady Ogilvie, Lady Gordon, Lady Kinloch, and Lady Mackintosh, who was Head of the Clan of that Name. The Ladies, after Tea, were preparing to dress for a Ball in the Evening, expecting the
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Rebels had gained the Victory; but the King’s Red-Coats were rude as to interrupt them, and lead them up a Dance they did not expect. [Italics authors own] 125

Although this account no doubt demonstrates the zeal these ladies had for the cause, it at no point places the ladies at the actual battle, let alone leading their troops - unlike the propagandised versions of the story. However, one of these four ‘principal ladies,’ Lady Ogilvy, undoubtedly spent some time with the Prince’s army. This is evident from her correspondence with her husband, the Jacobite commander Lord David Ogilvy (preserved in the University of Edinburgh’s Centre for Research Collections). Requesting Lady Ogilvy to join him at Inverness shortly before Culloden he writes: “If it’s possible find means to come through to Inverness by athol. The athol brigade will be by this time there to dislodge the Campbells out of athol if they have done it nothing is to hinder you to come…” [Sic]. 126 Judging by Ray’s description she obviously acceded to his request.

The correspondence goes on to shed light on another key activity to which the Jacobite ladies contributed - fundraising. This can be seen in Ogilvy’s words to his wife, Margaret, stating “if you don’t find a way to get money squee’d I’m undone the men has cost me fifteen pounds... so be active in finding cash”. 127 The advantage of having a wife at home whilst on campaign was that he could rely on her to harry their tenants for contribution whilst he was on the move. The evidence that women were commonly active in this capacity is corroborated by Lord George Murray, in a passing comment he makes in a letter to his brother Duke William:

126 Ogilvy, D., Letters to Lady Ogilvy, Jan/ Feb 1746, University of Edinburgh Library, La. II. 502, Folio 10
127 Ibid., (Feb. 1746), Folio 7
I told you, in my former, that some Gentlemen had promised more money in loan to his R.H. [Royal Highness] besides what they already gave, but it is to their Lady’s you will please to write, as they appear to do the thing, and not the husbands.\textsuperscript{128}

Thus, it becomes clear that whilst the active role of women in the Jacobite rebellions has been extensively sensationalised by both sides – either in an attempt to discredit or valorise it – it is still possible to see beyond the propaganda and credit women as multi-faceted assets to the Jacobite cause. They deserve to be remembered as such.

III.

Thus far, this chapter has been concerned almost exclusively with the pro-Jacobite political activities of women and little has been said about pro-Hanoverian women. Though as we have seen, pro-Hanoverian women were active in their receipt of petitions from their Jacobite counterparts, there is overwhelmingly more evidence of the political involvement of women in Jacobite rather than Whig politics. The last part of this chapter will examine the cultural environment of eighteenth-century Highland society that might explain this.

In the Highlands, religion was so deeply entwined with political allegiance that it could not help but affect all its inhabitants regardless of gender. Stana Nenadic argues that, after the Reformation, Catholic women informally took on the role of perpetuating religious practices amongst their relatives, as it was too politically dangerous for men (much in the same way as Margaret Nairne perpetuated Jacobite ideology in her family). This new role as the religious authority in the family gave women a sense of cultural empowerment. This contrasts with Protestant families, where “the power of women – already low – was eroded

\textsuperscript{128} Burton and Laing (eds.), \textit{Jacobite Correspondence}, (Sept. 1745) p.30
as it was elsewhere in Protestant society”. Indeed, Wiesner corroborates this, arguing that Protestantism removed the female role in religion through the abolition of convents, Mary as a focus of worship and female saints’ days. Instead, it emphasized “wifely obedience” and the “secondary status of women”. Thus, having a role within religion gave women a form of cultural empowerment that was not present in Protestantism. This was augmented by the Episcopalian (and Catholic) belief in the divine right of kings, which meant that many women of these denominations were already predisposed to support the Stuarts. The combination of both these factors incentivised more women to take an active role in Jacobite activities rather than pro-Hanoverian Whig politics - with its Presbyterian undertones. A visual representation of this phenomenon is offered in Burt’s letters from the North of Scotland:

Indeed, the difference between the Generality of those People [Jacobites] and the Presbyterians, Particularly the Women, is visible when they come from their respective Instructors, for the former appear with cheerful Countenances, and the others look as though they had been just before convicted and sentenced by their gloomy Teachers.

It seems too much to presume that all Jacobite women were carefree and all Whigs oppressed, but perhaps it did give them enough of a sense of personal empowerment to engage in the public sphere in ways which a Presbyterian upbringing would deny others. Indeed, as Murray Pittock argues, the Protestant tendency to condemn all-female communities, such as nunnery, pushed early modern feminists, like Mary Astell, into
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Jacobitism. She believed that only in single-sex communities could women’s full potential be achieved.\(^{132}\) Though Astell’s views were conceivably not representative of all eighteenth-century noblewomen, there certainly was a gendered aspect to Jacobitism. Jacobitism loitered on the outskirts of mainstream society. Consequently, politically marginalised groups (like women) became its natural allies, pinning their own hopes for change on its success. The alliance was mutually beneficial as the clandestine nature of the Jacobite movement meant that it would accept all volunteers ‘regardless of sex’.\(^{133}\)

Nevertheless, as McLynn points out, the long-term aims of Jacobitism were not especially advantageous for women.\(^{134}\) Despite this, the cause appealed as it offered the opportunity for women to step into the public sphere in a way they might never have been able to under the Hanoverian regime - as the examples earlier in the chapter demonstrate. Women like Jenny Cameron did this publicly, but others embraced their own gendered status to their advantage, acting as messengers, spies and accomplices. Perhaps the most famous case of this is Flora Macdonald carrying Prince Charlie from Uist to Skye; chosen because a woman would attract less attention than a man.\(^{135}\) But, we have also seen it other ways: first, with Lady Nairne contracting marriages for her children which would strengthen the families Jacobitism, second with Anne Mackintosh who raised troops for the Jacobites whilst her husband remained loyal, immune as a woman from the same harsh punishments as him.

This chapter is by no means claiming that all feminists were Jacobites or that all women craved access to the public sphere. However, for those that did seek a more empowered position, Jacobitism offered opportunities that the Hanoverian regime did not. Clearly, this
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was a significant number - noteworthy enough for contemporary Hanoverian propaganda to observe at any rate.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, I have found that the intricacies of the Murray’s family politics were in many ways representative of the wider Scottish nobility. Time and again the nobility demonstrated loyalty to personal connections over ideological conviction, just as Duke John did for his sons and brother. When seen in the context of the unsettled politico-religious environment of the past century, these social ties were clearly cultivated as a mechanism for the Scottish nobility to continue to prosper despite their ideological differences. Though, these instances did decline somewhat after the Forty-Five, this was not necessarily due to apathy on the part of the nobility but rather the harsher reaction from the Government - which was giving no quarter the second time round. Furthermore, the case study of the Murrays was especially useful for shedding light on the involvement of women in familial and wider politics. As I began to research this Chapter, I found that there were few secondary publications relating specifically to the part that women had to play in the rebellion, with the exception of Murray Pittock’s short section on ‘Warrior Women’ in his book *Jacobitism*. However, as I delved further into the primary evidence from the Murray family, it appeared that letters from or concerning its’ female members had been preserved in significant numbers. Evidence of the political guile of Lady Margaret Nairne and Lady Amelia Murray began to emerge and with it my hypothesis that other women may have been similarly involved. Though it is difficult to access the experiences of the many women who left behind no written record, the evidence that does survive points to noble women
actively engaging social networks to promote family interests. Yet at times, it amounted to more than this, showing women taking an active part in promoting Jacobitism - mostly through disseminating the ideology, but occasionally engaging in military activities as well. Thus, I found that, despite the lack of attention in many of the histories, by looking at the primary evidence it was possible to ascertain comprehensive roles of women during the rebellion. Hence, there is potential for much more work to be done in this area to fully give them justice in the historical record.
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